

WASHINGTON SENTINEL

VOL. XXVIII.

WASHINGTON CITY, D. C., SATURDAY APRIL 6, 1901

NO 40

Washington Sentinel.

Published and Edited by

LOUIS SCHADE.

APPEARS EVERY SATURDAY.



TERMS

\$3 per year for single copy sent by mail to subscribers, payable in advance

RATES OF ADVERTISING:

First insertion, one inch \$1.50 second insertion, 75 cents Liberal reductions for annual advertisements. Special notices 25 cents a line.

Advertisements to insure insertion \$10 to be handed in not later than 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

Office: No. 600 F Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Sample copies mailed upon application. Address LOUIS SCHADE, Washington, D. C.

THAT TAX AGAIN.

Brewers Serve Notice that they will Resist Further Neglect.

The Editor of the WASHINGTON SENTINEL has taken occasion repeatedly to impress upon Congress the fact that, in levying a double tax upon brewers while so many other sources of revenue better able to bear a share of the war's burdens were left practically untouched, an injustice was being done the effects of which would be apparent, sooner or later, in widespread disaster to the industry affected.

We have also held, in season and out of season, that ultimately brewers would be compelled to enter the arena of politics and array themselves in opposition to the party responsible for the continuance of the tax after the objects for which it was levied had been accomplished, and thus force the fulfillment of promises made to them.

Congress was not asked to accept mere assertions as proof of the destructive effects of this tax upon brewers. The United States Brewers' Association have worn that subject bare, in laying before that body through circulars, and by personal argument before its committees, evidence most comprehensive and indisputable in corroboration of their claims and in support of their demands for relief. A deaf ear was turned to all these appeals, not in ignorance of the real situation, but in neglect, or rather, we should say, in contempt of it. The miserable pittance of 25 cents a barrel awarded brewers was granted by the dominant party much in the spirit in which a boot-jack is hurled at a cat or a bone is given to an angry dog. No consideration of justice, no regard to promises solemnly made, no desire to relieve a business unfairly and oppressively burdened entered into the case at all. Their appeals were simply annoying, at a time when other things of more pressing importance in Congressional eyes pressed for recognition, and this shabby method was taken of quieting them.

The Administration never had any intention of fulfilling its promises to brewers, unless it meant to do so at the expense of interests which would never submit to such deception, and only fear of a coalition of elements hostile to its schemes influenced it in making any reduction whatever. Indeed, it has been said that, anticipating the passage of the Ship Subsidy and Nicaragua Canal bills, which carried millions of appropriations and would have absolutely forbade reduction of the war tax in any amount, the action of the Senate in conceding an additional 10 cents a barrel was solely with the view of providing for opposition that would defeat the bill, if such a course were found necessary.

At the opening of Congress the SENTINEL was in a position to say that the Democratic minority was unanimous for entire abolition of war taxes. Our authority was Hon. Jas. D. Richardson, leader of the Democrats. With the help of 30 Republican votes, mustered from the friends of brewers on that side of the House, a repeal bill could have been passed. We regret that some steps were not taken to bring about this result, so that the sincerity of the Senate and the professions of the President could have been put to a practical test. The outcome might have opened the eyes of the brewers sooner to a realization of the politics in the situation and have driven them to the conclusion they seem to have reached, as appears from evidently inspired articles in their official journals. But better late than never.

Now, as to the other point. The Editor of the SENTINEL has always

contended that more or less of politics—and oftener more than less—has been at the bottom of legislation directed against brewers. He has also contended that in politics will only be found a remedy for such legislation. We can easily understand brewers' aversion to this resort, but we could never see a hope outside of it. Our persistency has caused us loss of friends and loss of patronage. Our motives have been impugned and our arguments attacked. But after all, light is breaking and we perceive a ray of hope for the ultimate triumph of the views we have maintained and a vindication of the honesty of our intentions. The April number of the *Brewers' Journal*, official organ of the United States Brewers' Association, commenting on the insufficiency of the relief given brewers, says:

As the *Journal* has frequently pointed out, argumentative appeals to Congress, based on justice or principle, are mere waste of breath, where political exigencies or the personal interests of members are concerned. There is but one way in which the brewers can impress on the Government the justice of their demands, and it is to be hoped that means to this end will be provided through the more systematic organization of the brewing trade for combined action, which is at present in progress under the auspices of the United States Brewers' Association.

Quite suggestive. With the *Journal* we can say "There is but one way in which the brewers can impress on the Government the justice of their demands." We hope, however, our contemporary will not fare as badly as the SENTINEL has for its outspokenness.

The April number of the *American Brewer*, likewise an official mouthpiece of the United States Brewers' Association, summing up an article on the same subject, says:

However, there is a limit to all things, and the time will come when right triumphs over might and a stop is put to the unjust discriminations of our present Congressmen. In their conceit they do not notice that they are abusing the power which has been entrusted to them by the people, and the German brewers of the United States, representing 30 per cent. of the entire brewing industry, must gain the impression that these unfair measures are solely directed against them. If this opinion once gains ground among our brewers, then their patience might soon be exhausted, and they, who have shown themselves to be the friends of the ruling party, might become its most bitter adversaries.

Quite suggestive again. Evidently patience has ceased to be a virtue with brewers and they have made up their minds to seek a remedy for their wrongs and apply it. In no other way will they get relief. The Editor of the SENTINEL has advocated brewers' measures in Congress for the past thirty years, and without hesitation he can say that mere argument has about as much effect on the average Congressman as water on the back of a duck. The only appeal he will listen to is self-interest. When he is given to understand that brewers have votes and they propose to use them for their benefit, he will be quick to appreciate the necessity of consulting the interests of his constituents.

When a great party is given to understand that a calling as important to the Government as the brewing business cannot be hampered by vexatious laws and oppressed by burdensome taxes with impunity, to advance private jobs and political schemes, it will lose no time in responding to the suggestion, for it knows that in the hands of that calling is power sufficient to accomplish the overthrow of the most strongly entrenched organization that ever occupied a place in American politics.

In order to get rid of the iniquitous beer tax, the SENTINEL pledges itself to support any party that will accomplish this end. In many eyes the SENTINEL is a partisan paper. Will our non-partisan friends go as far?

Mon law is always to be deprecated, and when five hundred men armed with ropes, led by the president of the Mercantile Club, entered the Council Chamber of Kansas City, Kansas, and induced the council not to pass an ordinance extending the franchise of a street monopoly for thirty years after the people had just elected an administration pledged to defeat the job, they exerted what appears, in the circumstances, to have been a highly commendable form of moral suasion.

The London County Council is going to spend \$7,500,000 in building model cottages for workmen. The new municipal houses will accommodate 42,000 people,

A KANSAS HERO.

Funston's Act Wins Applause at Sacrifice of Honor.

Hurrah for the gallant Funston! He has done a great and noble deed!—says W. A. Croft in the *Post*—the greatest and noblest deed that our soldiers have performed since they shot Sitting Bull dead when he was a prisoner of war, and killed his men, women and children at a peace conference at Wounded Knee. Of this last victory Brig. Gen. Colby says: "One hundred warriors, and one hundred and twenty women and children were found dead on the field." * * * the object being only to kill Indians regardless of age or sex.

To be sure, Gen. Funston is not wholly original. His cunning is not without precedent. The sublime art of duplicity is not new. The good Gen. Jesup, in Florida, entrapped Osceola under a flag of truce and held him prisoner until he died of grief. Lord Clive served England in India by forgeries and lying that would disgrace a cannibal, if they had not been in such a holy cause. The fact that for a century and a half his name has been detested by all decent men, only shows that good men sometimes are martyrs to progress and benevolent assimilation.

Gen. William Henry Harrison, during hostilities accepted Tecumseh's invitation and visited him in his tent, accompanied only by an interpreter. One of the great chief's British allies suggested that he might detain his guest as a prisoner, and to him the uneducated savage scornfully replied: "I am a fighter, not a liar." So Blackhawk received Gen. Gaines under a flag of truce, and it does not seem to have occurred to the foolish warrior to seize or kill his very troublesome enemy. They had not learned the white man's "stratagem."

William Wallace, the renowned Scotch patriot, was captured by the identical "ruse" now repeated by the great Funston—and the "false Monteth" has for 600 years been execrated throughout Scotland. By the way, when Wallace was arraigned for treason he repudiated the charge on the ground that a man could not be a traitor to a country to which he had never acknowledged allegiance—the same plea that is now made by the wicked Aguinaldo. And it is worth remembering that the beheading of Wallace awakened the slumbering soul of Robert Bruce to lead the Scotch to victory and restore the liberties of his country. So the romantic and heroic Montrose was betrayed to the handsman by a degenerate Scotchman, of whom the Edinburgh poet says:

A traitor sold him to his foes;
O, deed of deathless shame!
I charge thee, boy, if e'er thou meet
With one of Assyria's same—
Be it upon the mountain side,
Or yet within the glen,
Stand he in martial gear alone,
Or backed by armed men—
Face him as thou would'st face the man
Who wronged thy sire's renown;
Remember of what blood thou art,
And strike the coward down.

Gen. Funston's exploit is not new even in Manila. Several years ago the same useful Macabebes made the same identical proposition to Polavieja—that they would go under pretense of surrendering some Spanish officers, and with the plausible lie capture the troublesome Aguinaldo. Polavieja was worse than Weyler—the most cruel and inhuman of all the Spanish generals—the wretch who shot Rizal—but he had some self respect left, and was not trained to latest "diplomacy," so he only laughed and said, "Oh, no! not that would be too dirty a trick!"

This feat of Funston's makes us wonder why Washington and Gen. Grant did not resort to similar tactics. In the confused battles of the Wilderness there were several occasions when Gen. Grant might have captured Lee in this way. He might have summoned Sheridan to his tent and said: "See here, Phil, this Lee has bothered us now for three years. I want you to dress yourself in your best uniform, get a Confederate flag and a bag of corn meal, capture a rebel sentinel, and subject him to the water cure torture till he tells you the countersign, then take a hundred of these deserters to us, whom we will enrich for their part in it, and with their lead and all well armed, make your way cautiously under forged passes to Lee's tent, over by that Run, on the plea that they have captured you and wish to surrender you. When he is thoroughly deceived shoot his

staff and grab him and bring him in."

Sheridan was quite bold enough to do this, but he would have considered the project a base one and spurned it, unless he had learned the very latest lessons in decency, morality, and truthfulness. Those who knew him declare that he would vigorously and profanely have expressed his opinion of the inventor of it and called him names.

The illustrious Funston must be rewarded for his deeds, for he has put the finishing touches on the duplicity that was begun in Manila Bay after our warships had been sent for Aguinaldo, and he had come and repeatedly demanded the independence of his people. To be sure, Funston has been mentioned for Governor of his State. The price is much too insignificant for such a doughty deed. Why would he not make a great President, especially as chicanery is the heart of the policy by which Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines are all to be dealt with to the end? Kansas should be proud of Frederick Funston and Carrie Nation—one distinguished for a superb violation of the laws of peace, and the other for a fearless violation of the laws of war.

David B. Hill on our Duty in South Africa.

In a recent editorial the *Washington Post* animadverts severely on Hon. David B. Hill for language used by him in regard to the attitude of the Administration in the Boer-British imbroglio. It admits that "we have facilitated the murder of the republics," and that "a heavy weight of responsibility is at the door of the party in power for that unnatural and un-American attitude."

Senator Hill stated, among other things, that "the supineness of this great republic in the present emergency, while witnessing the destruction of two struggling republics in South Africa and the substitution of a monarchical government in their place, is almost incomprehensible." And the *Post*, which has so steadfastly and nobly sustained the cause of the Boers, adds that his statement "was and is the truth fully spoken," and that "there is nothing stranger in our history than that supineness."

Now that "supineness" could only have been obviated by our insisting, in the first place, that the differences be submitted to arbitration. In what way were we supine if not in this? And on admitting that we were supine, it admits that we should have interferred. Yet it criticizes Mr. Hill for making this suggestion.

It is true we were more than supine, for we actively assisted the British through our consuls, and possibly by permitting contraband of war to be openly conveyed to the British from our ports, contrary to the rule laid down by President Grant during the Franco-German war. But our supineness consisted in our failure to actively interfere.

To state that the Monroe Doctrine was not an issue as in the Venezuelan case is to beg the question. The Monroe Doctrine was based on the fact that the South American republics were modeled after ours more than on the physical fact that they were on this continent. From that point of view the doctrine applied in the case of the South African republics. But if it is not Monroe Doctrine, it is good American doctrine—let us call it Hill doctrine, if you will.

As to Great Britain going to war with the United States in view of her fiasco in South Africa and her Russian imbroglio, it is a pure figment of the imagination. The fact is that the Administration did not know at first of the inherent weakness of Great Britain, and having been coddled into an "understanding," is ashamed to go back, and is a little afraid, perhaps, on account of the "troubles of our own" resulting from imperialism.

Senator Hill's suggestion, instead of being a "political extravagance," is a legitimate, practical corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, if, indeed, it is not an inherent part of that immortal pronouncement.

THE OLD STORY.

Mulct and Prohibition Laws in Iowa.

Every good citizen, says Col. Jos. Eiboeck, the veteran editor, in his *Iowa Staats Zeitung*, is interested in the enactment of good and just laws. Such laws the people sustain and aid in enforcing, while on the contrary, laws that are unjust and which are at variance with the people's conception of right and justice, or in other words, which public sentiment does not sustain, become inoperative at some vexation and annoyance and defeat the object for which they were enacted. Such a law is the prohibitory law of Iowa with its unfortunate annex of the mulct law. While the prohibitory law declares the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors a crime, the annex gives the dealers in liquors permission to commit the crime of manufacturing and selling upon payment of a heavy fine or mulct tax. Fair minded people, however zealous in the cause of preventing the traffic in liquors, cannot and do not endorse such a law which apparently has no other object but that of getting as much money as possible out of the dealers in liquors, caring nothing for the morality of the question, inviting crime, if it be a crime, to secure the shekels.

If it be a crime, no matter what the verbiage of the law is, no matter how stringent its provisions, there are comparatively few people, outside of the extreme wing of the prohibition element, who sincerely believe that it is a crime to sell beer and other liquors. However, it is sold in every city, town, village and hamlet in the State, and even more generally in the localities where the mulct law does not operate and the sale of liquors falls under the ban of the old prohibitory law. To be brief, it is used and sold everywhere by rich and poor, high and low, and directly under the eyes of the prohibition clergy and their followers; in drug stores, club rooms, joints and in every conceivable place and in every possible manner. This causes informations, complaints and arrests and fills our courts with suits and prosecutions and often persecutions for violations or assumed violations of the law, which were a just and practical license enacted in its place, such troubles would not arise. The liquor dealers would be put under proper restraint and public sentiment would secure the enforcement of the law and the hundreds of thousands of dollars which the tax-payers of the State are annually called upon to pay for such attempted enforcements and prosecutions, would be saved, while the consumption of liquors would not be greater and probably much less than under the existing law.

The constant bickering, denunciation and vilification on the part of that portion of the Protestant clergy who converts its pulpits into prohibition rostrums instead of a place where the higher themes of Christianity, of love and forbearance and forgiveness is taught, is becoming a source of unendurable annoyance to the better class of the people of Iowa who are beginning to demand a halt and to urge the repeal of the existing unjust and vexatious prohibitory law. They recognize in its further continuance only further annoyance and trouble without any compensating gain to morality and good order. They behold further millions of dollars annually going out of the State for beer, wine and liquors which could be retained here and would aid in the development of our towns and cities and help the farmers as well as the laboring men and while not causing any more liquors to be used than are used at present.

Fellow Citizens! Is it not time that a united, a concerted movement be made to secure the substitution of the present onerous and oppressive laws by another and better law? Let us think and act promptly and do what is to be done that the curse of secret drinking and its attendant crimes may be abolished and a law enacted which public sentiment will uphold and which will promote true temperance and not unbridled clandestine liquor selling in Iowa.

British Generalship in South Africa.

Probably everybody who reads the dispatches from the seat of war in South Africa, says the *Baltimore Sun*, has been struck with the frequency with which the Brit-

commander in chief announces the capture of rebellious horses, oxen, mules, and sheep from the enemy. Occasionally a half dozen Boers are drawn into the net, but on the whole the quarter of a million British soldiers who are scouring the veldt seem to be warring chiefly on the live stock of the republics. The intrepid General So and So goes out on an expedition and returns with enormous flocks of sheep which he surrounded and captured in the most dashing style, the four footed foe being unable to make any resistance to the mountain howitzers, pompons and bayonets of the enemy. That son of Mars the gallant colonel commanding the Hussars, makes a night attack upon a herd of oxen, strikes terror to their hearts and makes them surrender unconditionally. There was no such fighting all the world's history as Britain's warriors are now engaged in, and the success with which they are waging war upon the dumb animals of Boerland would make a Chicago meat packer turn green with envy. The meek and lowly ox, the timid sheep, the patient and long suffering mule all bear witness to the prowess of the Anglo-Saxon. The country about Pretoria, where General Lord Kitchener has his headquarters, is the biggest cattle ranch in the world—only the cattle are prisoners of war, and not at liberty, as of yore, to roam at will. Lieutenant Col. Henderson, of the British army, is now engaged in writing the official history of the war. It is to be hoped that he will not neglect this feature of the conflict, for it is without parallel, so far as modern warfare is concerned. Never before have a quarter of a million of regulars and volunteers been engaged for months in campaigning against domestic animals. Never before have dashing hussars, sturdy infantrymen, intrepid artillerymen, and rangers, yeomanry and scouts innumerable been employed in rounding up cattle. Perhaps some poet will yet arise to tell the world in stirring numbers all about the charge of the light brigade upon the embattled sheep of Boerland—how the fearless troopers rode into the very jaws of death; how the "thin red line" of infantry outflanked a command of Jersey cows and smote them hip and thigh; how army corps of mules succumbed to the valor of the Lancashire and Northumber land herds. Not only ought these exploits to find a page in history and to be told in verse, but they should also be given a place on canvas, among the historic battle scenes of Britain. King Edward ought to send the court painter and poet laureate to South Africa at once.

THE BEAUTIFUL ORIENT.

It Is One of the Midway's Interesting Attractions.

Nearly \$3,000,000 will be required to construct and equip the wonderful Midway at the Pan-American Exposition. The greatest care has been taken to prevent any approach toward the "fake" show, and the visitor may rest assured that he will not be subjected to fraud or extortion so long as he remains upon the Exposition grounds. It is difficult to single out any attraction in this section as more prominent or worthy than another, for all have their special merit and novelty.

The Beautiful Orient will represent life as it existed in the East before the advent of the modern tourist. Gaston Akoon, director of this concession, is arranging to have native representative characters to convey proper impressions of oriental customs and manners of living. He will have plenty of room in which to display the different salient features that would appeal in the strongest terms to people accustomed to our western civilization. A holy Mecca will be the meeting place of the East to the last, and on this score—we are disposed to think that the rights reserved to us under the Clayton Bulwer treaty are not at the present day and in the altered circumstances of the case of overwhelming importance to Great Britain. Nobody doubts that we have those rights, and no sane person can maintain that a mere resolution by the Senate can override them. Obviously it was not easy for Lord Salisbury's Government to submit to the somewhat arbitrary and dictatorial methods of the Senate. If, however, America is still anxious to spend her money in constructing and fortifying a canal and in making herself to that extent more vulnerable there seems to be reason of sound policy why Great Britain should cast obstacles in her way.

The matter is not one that is worth while fighting about from the point of view of British interests. Why, then, should not the Clayton Bulwer Treaty be quietly abrogated by the consent of both parties?

FOREIGN NEWS.

Translated and Selected from leading European papers for the SENTINEL.

ENGLAND.

The Canal Treaty.

London Times, March 12.

It was absolutely impossible for us to accept the one sided document which the Senate chose to substitute for the agreement Mr. McKinley and Mr. Hay had submitted to Lord Pauncefote, which we consented to sign and which we remained ready and willing to ratify until the period fixed for ratification expired. No Government and no people could have accepted, without sacrificing their self respect, that travesty of the bargain which Mr. McKinley and Mr. Hay had asked us to conclude. American politicians themselves, while they were urging us to surrender to the dictation of the body which had repudiated the President's proposals, freely acknowledged that their own countrymen would have rejected with indignation the suggestion that America should do what they asked England to do. * * * It is for the Washington Government to make overtures if they desire to prosecute the scheme. Notwithstanding all that has occurred, those overtures, if made, will doubtless be entertained by us in the same amiable and reasonable spirit in which we considered and accepted Mr. Hay's original draft treaty. But until they are made we simply drop the question which was raised, not by us, but by the United States, and we take our stand on the rights incontestably assured to us by the Clayton Bulwer treaty. We shall be ready to assent to reasonable modifications of its clauses when we are asked to do so and when there is a fair probability that the Senate will accept our concessions in the spirit in which they are offered. Until that time arrives, we have no grounds for dissatisfaction with our existing legal position, a position which we do not intend to abandon except upon terms which have been concerted in a friendly manner with ourselves.

London Standard, March 12.

From last week's debates in the [American] Senate, one would infer nothing less than instant abrogation of the treaty would satisfy the outraged majesty of the Republic. The United States, it is said, will proceed to construct the canal forthwith, in absolute defiance of any international instrument which prohibits that course of action. Fortunately, these thunders have left the majority of Mr. Morgan's countrymen quite undisturbed, and have drawn down well deserved rebukes from the most influential organs in the press. We have felt far too much confidence in the American sense of justice and legality to suppose that the repudiation of the Clayton Bulwer treaty could be regarded as a serious possibility. The "denunciation" of a solemn international compact, by one of the parties without the consent of the other, would be a discreditable and dishonorable act. Between civilized powers a treaty cannot be thrown over merely because its provisions happen to be found inoperative. The Americans, who yield to no people in their strict respect for the sanctity of private contracts, will assuredly not permit their politicians to hurry them into any such cynical breach of public morality. If the convention of 1850 is abrogated, it must be by mutual consent not by the arbitrary and extra legal act of one of the signatories. We shall hold it valid until it is regularly repealed, and we shall confidently expect that, so long as it is in force, no attempt will be made to invade the rights secured to us under its provisions. * * * In spite of the fire eaters of the Senate, the Americans will abide by their engagements, knowing very well that any equitable proposition they make to us will meet with a ready and cordial response.

London Daily News, March 12.

The Hay Pauncefote negotiations were designed to enable America to construct the canal and yet to preserve to this country certain rights, and to be important in themselves, but apparently objectionable to the prevailing sentiment of the Senate. Now, apart altogether from any question of a lack of diplomatic delicacy on the part of the Senate in the wording of the amendments—and a Government that includes Mr. Chamberlain in its list of trusted negotiators ought to be the last to commit itself on this score—we are disposed to think that the rights reserved to us under the Clayton Bulwer treaty are not at the present day and in the altered circumstances of the case of overwhelming importance to Great Britain. Nobody doubts that we have those rights, and no sane person can maintain that a mere resolution by the Senate can override them. Obviously it was not easy for Lord Salisbury's Government to submit to the somewhat arbitrary and dictatorial methods of the Senate. If, however, America is still anxious to spend her money in constructing and fortifying a canal and in making herself to that extent more vulnerable there seems to be reason of sound policy why Great Britain should cast obstacles in her way.

London Morning Leader, March 12.

By playing dog in the manger and preventing America from building the canal on her own terms we are inflicting a heavy loss on our own trade and our own shipping. We can only stand to gain by a quick sea route to Peru in the south and San Francisco in the north, a route, too, which is also an alternative path to the Far East and Australasia.

War is always a remote contingency and war with the United States, we hope, grotesquely remote. For a doubtful advantage in the event of war we are throwing away a vast and certain gain in years of peace.

Russian Students and Russian Social Reform.

Frankfurter Zeitung.

It is now nearly twenty-three years since the Russian Chief of Police Trepov was twice fired at and severely wounded by a student Vera Safilitch, who came to see him, bringing a petition. This was the signal for a revolutionary movement which shook the body politic to its very foundations, and was only brought to an end by the murder of the Emperor Alexander II. Now, only last week, a Russian student, named Karpo-lich, has shot and severely injured Bogolopov, the Russian Minister of Education, under similar circumstances. As it now appears that the attack was not made out of private revenge, as first appeared, but from political motives, it is worth while dealing with the matter more seriously. As in the attack on Trepov, it is rather the system than the personality which excites the animosity of these enthusiasts, though it may be remarked that in both cases the students had no cause to cherish any very unfavorable feelings towards the official. Trepov had ordered his prisoners the lash, and Bogolopov—we have no means of knowing how such a man came to be elevated to the important and responsible position of Minister of Education in Russia—had attempted to suppress all attempts at freedom among the students by those police methods which have so long been the custom in Russia, but which tend rather to aggravate than to cure the evils they are intended to suppress.

The ordinary idea of student life in Russia is that the youth of the country only go to the university because it is the easiest path to an official life. The idea is only partially correct, for large numbers of the Russian students submit to the greatest privations in order to obtain a university career, and they know well enough that they have no chance of a post under Government. Apart from this, it may be remarked that a considerable number of these posts offer very few attractions to men with any conscience. Be that as it may, it is sheer desire for knowledge that attracts a large proportion of the youth of Russia to the universities. There is a good deal of idealism about the Russian student, in spite of his repulsive exterior, and the Government, in trying to treat him like a child, has done its best to foster a desire for martyrdom in him. The truth is that in Russia the Government has never realized that in the hands of the youth of the country, and not only of the youth at the universities, lies the future of Russia, and the student men of the present day seem to have adopted the policy of the first Nicholas, and to wish to treat them like soldiers. Any symptoms of discontent with the attitude of the Government, or what the bureaucrats take to be discontent, are punished by forcible enrolment in the army. It may be remarked that the Russian soldiers are far better treated than they were fifty years ago, and that therefore the punishment of compulsory service is not so severe as it was when Nicholas I. was Emperor. But the principle is the same—the Government thinks that intellectual movements can be stamped out by military discipline.

The Minister of Finance, Von Witte, spoke last week in no measured terms about the methods of the police, and it is reported that the Ministers of War and Justice were very much opposed to the decision given in the Kiev case, while the Home Secretary and the Minister of Education supported it. It is not likely, however, that the military authorities objected to the sentence of compulsory service, for the Emperor occasionally endorsed it, or at least it could not have been carried out if he had decided against it. We must therefore conclude that the policy of reaction is not only strong but also successful with the Emperor's advisers. And it would be a thousand pities if the attack on the Minister of Education served only to irritate those Ministers who fail to see the social development must be the saving of Russia, and to incite them still further to reactionary measures.

A Peace Congress.

Paris Le Matin.

Rather an unexpected congress is at this moment being held in Paris. It is a well known fact that in all the countries of Europe and America committees were being formed spontaneously for the object of bringing about a pacific intervention on the part of the Powers in the Anglo-Boer conflict. These committees, which represent the voice of the peoples, remind diplomats of the actions they themselves accomplished at the Hague, and on which they prided themselves so much.

At a time when events are becoming critical in South Africa, the committees, until now independent of each other, have decided to send delegates to Paris to arrange some energetic action. They have chosen our capital, firstly, out of gratitude for the enthusiastic welcome given to President Kruger, and secondly because the committee in favor of the independence of the Boers, presided over by Senator Pauliat, has shown special activity and vigilance on all occasions. Nearly all the delegates come from Germany, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Belgium, Austria, Spain and Italy, have arrived. The one from the United States is expected. At the first general assembly important decisions will be come to with the object of making communication between the different national committees more easy. Perhaps the first thing done will be to appeal to the English people. The next object will be to arrange the order of a simultaneous action in Parliament.